

REMARKS

Status

Claims 12-19, as previously presented, were at issue in the Office Action mailed on December 15, 2008. The present response does not add or cancel any claims. Accordingly, it is claims 12-19 which are at issue.

The Rejection

In the Office Action mailed on December 15, 2008, claims 12-16, 18 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Weissmueller et al. (US 6,824,194). Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Weissmueller et al.

Applicant thanks the Office Action and the explanation of the rejections of the claims.

Remarks Directed to the Rejection of Claims 12-16, 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Weissmueller et al. is cited as anticipating claims 12-16, 18 and 19. With respect to independent claim 12, this claim has been carefully amended such that at least one of the plurality of hinges is held in an idle state when the cover part is moved in the first direction and at least another of the plurality of hinges is held in an idle state when the cover part is moved in the second direction. Weissmueller is stated to disclose “at least one of the plurality of hinges (12) is held in an idle state when the cover part is moved in the first direction and the second direction (see figures 4 and 6).” Although, Applicant concedes that hinge 12 of Weissmueller et al. is held in an idle state when the cover part moves in a second direction (see Figures 2, 5 and 6), Weissmueller does not disclose a different hinge that is held in an idle state when the cover part moves in a first direction (see Figures 2-4). As such, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 12 as currently amended is not anticipated or made obvious by the cited prior

art and requests that independent claim 12 and all claims dependent thereon be moved towards allowance.

With respect to claim 19, this claim recites in part “a drive element for moving the at least one locking lever.” The driver 31 of Weissmueller et al. does not move the locking lever 18 as cited in the Office Action, but in fact moves the arm 13 as shown in Figures 2-4. As such, Applicant submits that claim 19 is not anticipated by Weissmueller et al.

Remarks Directed to the Rejection of Claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 17 is dependent upon independent claim 12 which is now submitted to be in allowable form. As such, claim 17 is also submitted to be in allowable form. Therefore, Applicant requests that the rejection of claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn and the claim moved towards allowance.

Summary

This response is being submitted after the entry of a final rejection. Given the fact that these remarks clarify the nature of the claimed subject matter and the prior art, and place the application in condition for allowance, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner give consideration to the remarks and pass this application on to allowance.

Any questions, comments or suggestions the Examiner may have which would place the application in still better condition for allowance should be directed to the undersigned attorney.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in the fees filed, asserted to be filed or which should have been filed herewith (or with any paper hereafter filed in this application by this firm) to our Deposit Account No. 07-1180.

Dated: April 14, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Mark Harper, Ph.D./

Mark A. Harper, Ph.D.

Registration No.: 60,248

GIFFORD, KRASS, SPRINKLE, ANDERSON
& CITKOWSKI, P.C.

2701 Troy Center Drive, Suite 330

Post Office Box 7021

Troy, Michigan 48007-7021

(248) 647-6000

Attorney for Applicant